

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

KEVIN ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT BANNISTER, et. al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:19-cv-02091-KJD-NJK

ORDER

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a state prisoner. On July 22, 2020, this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file his updated address with this Court by August 21, 2020. (ECF No. 8). This deadline has passed, and Plaintiff has not filed his updated address or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson*

1 *v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and  
2 failure to comply with local rules).

3 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey  
4 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:  
5 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to  
6 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
7 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
8 *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;  
9 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.


10 In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in  
11 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket,  
12 weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs  
13 in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of  
14 unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See  
15 *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor – public policy  
16 favoring disposition of cases on their merits – is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor  
17 of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
18 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
19 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779  
20 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file his updated address with the  
21 Court by August 21, 2020 expressly stated this action would be dismissed if Plaintiff did  
22 not timely comply with the order. (ECF No. 3 at 8). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning  
23 that dismissal would result from his failure to timely comply with the Court's order to file  
24 his updated address.

25 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on  
26 Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's July 22, 2020  
27 order.

28 It is further ordered that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 7)  
is denied as moot.

1           It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly and  
2 close this case. No other documents shall be filed in this closed case.

3  
4           Dated: September 4, 2020



5  
6           \_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE